

73690



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CAU 1615
PATENT 7/7/00
R6

In Re U.S. Patent Application

) Art Unit: 1615

Applicant: Edwin H. Christensen

)
) I hereby certify that this correspondence is
) being deposited with the United Postal
) Service as first class mail in an envelope
) addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of
) Patents, Washington, DC 20231, on
) June 27, 2000

Serial No.: 09/160,618

Filed: September 24, 1998

For: **SEMI-MOIST ORAL DELIVERY
SYSTEM**

) 
) Gerald T. Shekleton Reg. No. 27,466 Date

Examiner: T. Ware

)
)
)

RESPONSE

Box NON-FEE AMENDMENT
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

JUL 8 5 2000

Sir:

TECH CENTER 1000/2000

The communication of June 21, 2000 has indicated that the response filed March 27, 2000 was not fully responsive and required a further response to the double patenting rejection.

Applicant notes that claims 1-8, and 10-22 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 4,284,652. The cited patent is directed to a pet food which, at least in claim 1, is a maintenance pet food. Applicant's claims call for a carrier for an additive. The carrier is not a maintenance pet food, which specifically requires a protein source and thus, being directed to such a maintenance pet food whereas Applicant's invention is directed to a carrier